

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action mailed November 7, 2006, and the Advisory Action mailed January 9, 2007 have been received and reviewed. Claims 1, 4 through 6, 8 through 15, and 17 through 19 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 14 and 15 stand rejected. Claims 5, 6, 8 through 13, and 17 through 19 are allowed. Applicants have canceled claims 4 and 15, amended claims 1 and 14, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

No new matter has been added, support for the amendments being found in the specification as filed in at least paragraphs [0025] through [0029], and the drawings.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,709,910 to Argyle et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,285,668 to Pepe

Claims 1, 4 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Argyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,709,910) in view of Pepe (U.S. Patent No. 4,285,668). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

Claims 4 and 15 are canceled, rendering the rejection moot with respect thereto.

Claim 1 is amended to remove the limitation that the adjustable baffle apertures of the first and second baffles of the processing chamber are "non-equidimensional" in light of the Examiner's detailed comments in the rejection set forth in the Final Office Action, and to insert that the adjustable baffle apertures are "sizable and configurable" to accept "differently sized and shaped substrates of substantially matching, but slightly smaller, cross-section." (emphasis added). This amendatory language is similar to that suggested by the Examiner in the context of

claim 19, and is believed to patentably distinguish Applicants' invention from the combination of Argyle et al. in view of Pepe. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion of the claim limitations in the combination of references.

Further, Applicants have amended claim 1 by reciting that the entry seal baffle aperture is similarly adjustable in size and configuration, and to add the subject matter of claim 4, proposed now canceled with, again, the limitation that the exit seal baffle apertures is adjustable in size and configuration. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Argyle et al. with Pepe fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of first and second baffles having first and second adjustable (in size and configuration) apertures separating first and second regions from a constricted medial region, in combination with entry and exit seals having baffles with adjustable (in size and configuration) apertures and respectively communicating with the first and second regions of the processing chamber. In addition, there is no teaching or suggestion of entry and exit seals *per se* having apertures adjustable in size and configuration.

Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is allowable.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,709,910 to Argyle et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,285,668 to Pepe and U.S. Patent No. 2,545,576 to Godley

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Argyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,709,910) in view of Pepe (U.S. Patent No. 4,285,668) and Godley (U.S. Patent No. 2,545,576).

Claim 14 is allowable as depending from claim 1, as proposed to be amended herein. Applicants thank the Examiner for her observation regarding the terminological inconsistency between claim 1 as proposed to be amended in response to the Final Office Action and claim 14 due to the latter's recitation of "the non-equidimensional" substrate, such term having been deleted from claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 14 to remove the inconsistency, enhance antecedent basis and more properly frame the apparatus limitation.

### **ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS**

The amendments to claims 1 and 14 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification (see at least paragraphs [0025] through [0029]) and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-14 and 17-19 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen R. Christian/

Stephen R. Christian  
Registration No. 32,687  
Attorney for Applicants  
P.O. Box 1625  
Idaho Falls, ID 83415-3899  
Phone: (208) 526-9140  
Fax: (208) 526-8339

Date: 6 February 2007